

### **REMARKS**

The Office Action of March 13, 2008 has been reviewed and the Examiner's comments carefully considered. Claims 1-17 are pending in this application and claims 1, 7, and 9-17 are amended herewith in accordance with the original application as filed. Accordingly, claims 1-17 are currently under examination in this application, and claims 1, 9 and 13 are in independent form.

#### **35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejections**

Claims 1-8, 11 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for asserted indefiniteness. The indefinite term "design" has been amended to the term "structure" in claims 1 and 7 and amended to "configuration" in claims 11 and 13. The limitation of "said plural petal structures" in claim 14 has been amended to "said plural structures". Further, claims 15-17 are amended herewith to clarify what is meant by the terms "different" and "identical". In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections**

Claims 1-17 stand rejected for asserted anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by U.S. Patent No. 5,256,123 to Reinbolt (hereinafter, "Reinbolt"). However, after more clearly characterizing the technical features of amended independent claims 1, 9 and 13 of the present invention, the Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims are patentable over Reinbolt and in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein.

The Examiner states that Reinbolt discloses a hollow columnar vaginal member 50 comprising a main body 120, a minor part 100 and a screw or fastener "jointing design" 140 formed between the main body 120 and minor part 100 for connection between the two. However, the hollow columnar vaginal member 50 in Reinbolt is quite different from that of the presently amended claim 1.

As shown in Figs. 2 and 3 and described in column 3, line 27 to column 4, line 43 of Reinbolt's specification, member 50 packages main body 120 and minor part 100 therein. Via the openings formed on main body 120 and minor part 100, fluids injected into member 50 would pass therethrough and then member 50 would expand accordingly. In

other words, to a person of ordinary skill in the art, main body 120 and minor part 100 are known for providing a basic structure for maintaining the form of the extendable and expandable member 50. Accordingly, although main body 120 and minor part 100 are designed as a detachable apparatus, it is impossible for them to be detached in the vagina, not only since they are packaged in member 50, but also because they are essential for maintaining the form of member 50 in the vagina.

With regard to the present amended claim 1, it is recited that the vaginal mold including the main body the minor part and the jointing structure is detachable in the vagina. As shown in Figs. 3(A) to 3(E) and the relevant descriptions thereof in Paragraphs [0035] to [0036] of the present specification, the main body 11 and the minor part 12 are detachable in the vagina optionally. Accordingly, the present amended claim 1 is novel over the teachings of Reinbolt.

Moreover, since Reinbolt emphasizes that main body 120 and minor part 100 are used for providing an internal structure, i.e. chamber 70, for member 50, chamber 70 cannot surely be detached when member 50 is posited in the vagina. In contrast, the presently claimed vaginal mold is detachable in the vagina and can be removed partially for avoiding the full thickness skin graft (FTSG) from being displaced, peeled, inversed and/or pulled during the removing process. Thus, based on the foregoing, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to the teachings of Reinbolt and conceive of directly positing "an internal structure" of member 50 into the vagina. Therefore, the vaginal mold detachable in the vagina recited in presently amended claim 1 is also non-obvious over the teachings of Reinbolt.

In conclusion, the vaginal mold of presently amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Reinbolt. Moreover, the technical feature that "the vaginal mold detachable in the vagina" in claim 1 is non-obvious and advantageous over Reinbolt for avoiding the FTSG from being displaced, etc. as discussed above. Claims 2-8 depend directly from and add further limitations to independent claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claim 1. Therefore, for all the above reasons, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1-8 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 9 and 13 are also amended herein to embrace the technical feature of the present invention that the vaginal mold is detachable in the vagina. Thus, in light of the reasons discussed herein with regard to the patentability of claim 1 over Reinbolt,

Application No. 10/829,594  
Paper Dated: July 11, 2008  
In Reply to USPTO Correspondence of March 13, 2008  
Attorney Docket No. 3744-043984

currently amended independent claims 9 and 13 also cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by Reinbolt. Claims 10-12 and 14-17 depend directly from and add further limitations to independent claims 9 and 13, respectively, and are believed to be allowable for the reasons discussed hereinabove in connection with independent claims 9 and 13. Therefore, for all the above reasons, reconsideration of the rejection of claims 10-12 and 14-17 is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing, Applicant asserts that the presently claimed invention is novel and non-obvious over the cited prior art. As such, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-17 are respectfully requested. Therefore, Applicant submits that all of pending claims 1-17 are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

THE WEBB LAW FIRM

By Patricia A. Olosky

Patricia A. Olosky  
Registration No. 53,411  
Attorney for Applicant  
436 Seventh Avenue  
700 Koppers Building  
Pittsburgh, PA 15219  
Telephone: (412) 471-8815  
Facsimile: (412) 471-4094  
E-mail: webblaw@webblaw.com